REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-11, 13, and 16-19 are presently pending. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11, 13, and 16 are amended. Claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 14, 15, 20-22 are cancelled without prejudice.

Each of the pending claims presently stand rejected. Continued Examination and Reconsideration in view of the Request for Continued Examination, the foregoing amendments, and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6-7, 9-10, 13, 16-17, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art in view of U.S. Patent 5,903,225 ("Schmitt"). Claims 2, 3, 11, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Applicants Admitted Prior Art in view of Schmitt and U.S. Patent 5,243,652 ("Teare").

According to Examiner, "AAPA discusses the problem associated with requiring users to access a computer system from a particular client terminal in a computer network. AAPA does not however teach providing a solution to the problem of 'reduce(ing) the secure terminal to a dedicated terminal for accessing the computer network' by determining if a mobile device associated with the user and being separate from the client terminal is within a predetermined location." Examiner has also cited the statement that "some computer systems use a time varying randomly generated password for each authorized user", as Applicants Admitted Prior Art. First Office Action at 3-4.

Examiner indicated that "Schmitt teaches determining whether a mobile device (transmitter 220 - see col. 12 lines 45+) is within a predetermined location in order to

determine whether or not to grant access to sensitive data. See col. 12 lines 53+. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have solved the security problem of AAPA by using a geographic location device, in light of the teachings of Schmitt et al. in order provide a means for securing a computer network." Final Office Action, at 2.

Claims 1, 8, and 16 have been to include "determining" "whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal". Assignee respectfully submits that AAPA as alleged by Examiner, Schmitt, or Teare, along or in combination, teach or fairly suggest "determining" "whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal".

Even if the statement that "some computer systems use a time varying randomly generated password for each authorized user" were Prior Art, the "AAPA does not teach" "determining if a mobile device associated with the user and being separate from the client terminal is within a predetermined location" (Final Office Action at 2) much less "determining" "whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal".

Additionally, even if Schmitt teaches determining whether a mobile device (transmitter 220 – see col. 12, lines 45+) is within a predetermine location in order to determine whether or not to grant access to sensitive data"

there is no teaching in Schmitt of a mobile device "providing a time varying password".

The Teare reference does not even discuss passwords, much less "determining" "whether a mobile terminal providing a time varying password is within a predetermined location, said mobile terminal being separate from the client terminal".

Accordingly, Assignee requests withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1, 8, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Additionally, Claims 6 and 13 have been amended to recite that the "the time varying password is indicative of the location of the mobile terminal". Even if, AAPA teaches that "some computer systems use a time varying randomly generated password for each authorized user" there is no teaching that "the time varying password is indicative of the location of the mobile terminal". Schmitt and Teare have been thoroughly reviewed and neither teach that "the time varying password is indicative of the location of the mobile terminal". Accordingly, Assignee requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

For the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims, claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-11, 13, and 16-19 should be allowed. Accordingly, the Application is now in a condition for allowance and Examiner is requested to pass the case to issuance.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

January 05, 2006

Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Assignee

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison – Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Voice (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100